		7770	25X1
SUBJECT: Israel's Search for	More Capable Submarines	;	
NESA M# 86-20061 SW M# 86-20031			
DISTRIBUTION:	DATE	4/30/86 File	
EXTERNAL:	DOC NO	NEEN W 86-30001	
1 - David L. Anderson, Penta	agon OCR <u>3</u>		
INTERNAL:	P&PD _	<u>/</u>	
1 - DDI 1 - NIO/NESA 1 - CPAS/ILS 6 - CPAS/IMD/CB 1 - D/NESA 1 - DD/NESA 1 - C/PPS/NESA 2 - PPS/NESA 2 - PPS/NESA 1 - C/PES 1 - NID Staff 1 - PDB Staff 1 - PDB Staff 1 - OSWR/NSD/UWB 1 - NESA/IA 1 - NESA/IA 1 - NESA/SO 1 - NESA/AI 2 - NESA/AI/I	o Analyst to Source)		

28 April 1986

25X1

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/01/25 : CIA-RDP86T01017R000202290001-5

SECRET

DDI/NESA/AI/I/

Central Intelligence Agency



Washington, D. C. 2050S DIRECTORATE OF INTELLIGENCE

28 April 1986

Israel's Search for More Capable Submarines

Summary

Israel wants to procure three Dolphin-class diesel subamrines with the US Foreign Military sales funds to replace the three Type 206 subamrines currently in its inventory. The Israeli navy would like to take delivery on the first submarine in 1992 to support its ambitious plans for a "blue water" navy capable of operating more widely and for extended periods in the Central Mediterranean and Red Seas. In our judgment, submarines of this particular design are not absolutely essential to the Israeli navy's ability to perform its traditional missions. We do not believe that a two or three year delay in the delivery of these vessels would seriously degrade the navy's ability to defend Israel.

25**X**1

* * * * * *

The acquisition of three Dolphin-class diesel submarines by the early 1990s is one of the Israeli navy's top procurement priorities. In our judgment, boats of this particular design are not absolutely essential to the Navy's ability to perform its traditional missions of coastal defense, maintenance of sea lines of communication, and support of air and ground combat operations. Without the Dolphins or submarines of similar capabilities, however, the Israelis cannot realize their ambitions to operate more widely and for extended periods in the Central Mediterranean and Red Seas.

25X1

This memorandum was prepared by	the Israel-
Jordan-PLO Branch, Arab-Israeli Division, Office of	Near Eastern
and South Asian Analysis, and	
Office of Se	cientific and
Weapons Research, with a contribution by	the
Subcontinent Branch, South Asia Division, Office of	Near Eastern
and South Asian Analysis. Information as of 25 Aprused in its preparation. Comments and questions should be a second seco	ould be
directed to Chief, Arab-Israeli Division,	
	NESA M# 86-20061
	CT 344 06 20021

SECRET

25X1

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/01/25: CIA-RDP86T01017R000202290001-5

25*X*

25X1

25X1

25X1 25X1 25X1

	2
Israel wants to continue to modernize its navy because of the growth of Arab fleetsmainly those of Syria and Libyain recent years (see Annex). It has been particularly anxious to develop a "blue water" submarine capability to assist in monitoring Libyan naval activities, especially those supporting terrorist missions. Israel also probably wants to be able to insert and remove commando teams. In wartime, the Israelis would prefer to destroy Libyan combatantsparticularly Libya's five operational diesel subamrineswell before they get within striking range of Israel's shores or bottle them up by mining harbors.	2:
Capabilities of Dolphin-Class Submarines	
Dolphin-class subamrines are not particularly well-suited for some of these duties. Diesel submarines cannot move quickly from one area to another without giving away their position, and submarines in general are poor platforms for broad-sea reconnaissance missions, such as monitoring terrorist activities, unless they are acting on very detailed intelligence tip-offs. Moreover, the vast majority of Arab surface combatants that could threaten Israel are guided-missile patrol boats whose high speed and small size make them difficult targets for a submarine to engage. Other systems, particularly maritime patrol aircraft and longer-range fast patrol boats, contribute more than submarines in broad-area searchs and the long-range interception of surface vessels and submarines.	2
Nevertheless, the Dolphin-class submarines are more capable than the Type 206 boats currently in Israel's inventory. The Dolphins' 4,500-nautical-mile range is nearly double that of the Type 206s', and their endurance is 50 percent greater. Moreover, the Dolphins carry 60 percent more torpedoes or antiship missiles and require only four more crewmen to operate. They can also sow mineswhich Israel's Type 206s cannotand transport a much larger commando contingent.	2
The navy says it wants to replace its three Type 206 boats with these new and better Dolphins combatants by 1992, when the Type 206s will near the end of their service lives. have already	
discovered cracks in the hulls of their Type 206s. These structural problems and the experience that other navies have had boats of similar design make the Israelis reluctant to keep their	2

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/01/25 : CIA-RDP86T01017R000202290001-5	
	25 X 1
Budgetary Problems	
The Israeli military establishment is grappling with defense budget cuts, and the navy, which has traditionally been the stepchild of the Israel Defense Forces, stands to lose heavily in the interservice competition for procurement funds. the Ministry of Defense is aware that	25X1 25X1
naval construction has been ignored for the last several years and cannot be postponed any further.	25 X 1
The commander of the navy has argued that \$13-23 million in Foreign Military Sales (FMS) monies must be obligated in the next few months for preliminary design and contract work and long-lead procurement if the navy is to receive attack submarines by 1992. Nevertheless, Tel Aviv may ultimately be forced to help adjust for cost overruns of the Lavi fighter aircraft program by delaying the acquisition of the Dolphins. In our view, a two or three year delay in delivery would not seriously degrade the	
Israeli navy's ability to carry out its principal missions.	25X1 25X1
Tel Aviv wants to finance the submarine program, which US defense officials say will cost about \$450 million, with FMS funds. US off-shore procurement policy, however, is proving troublesome to the Israelis, who had hoped to convince Washington to approve the off-shore expenditure of FMS funds to have the Dolphin hulls built in West Germany by Howaldtswerke-Deutsche Werft (HDW), a shipbuilding firm with extensive experience in submarine construction.	
not be forthcoming, nor, according to press reports, will a US	25 X 1
shipyard construct the boats.	25 X 1
Israeli Shipbuilding	
It appears that the only alternative will be for Israel Shipyards, Ltd. to build the submarines at its yard in Haifa. Although Israel Shipyards, Ltd. has built nearly 60 ships, various heavy steel strucures for Israel's petrochemical industry, and large storage tanks, it has never attempted the complex task of submarine construction. Naval construction experts consider the firm's personnel to be skilled and resourceful, but the yard probably would still need substantial technical assistance from West German design engineers and construction specialists to assemble the boats nearly as	
efficiently as HDW.	25 X 1
India's experience in assembling Type 209 submarines may be	

India's experience in assembling Type 209 submarines may be instructive. The Mazagon Docks in Bombay also had had fairly broad experience in ship construction, but had never built a submarine. Its personnel had major problems in mastering the welding techniques necessary to connect the pressure hull sections properly, even though Indian shipwrights had directly assisted in the construction of the first two hulls at the HDW

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/01/25 : CIA-RDP86T01017R000202290001-5	
	25 X 1
yard in Kiel. Moreover, Indian machinists were not accustomed to working to the close tolerances specificed for installation of the submarines' propulsion systems. These problems resulted in	
major delays.	25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

ANNEX

Israeli military planners routinely produce worst-case assessments. Their view of the Arab-Israeli naval balance is no exception. They usually include Egyptian forces in their threat assessments, even though Cairo has continued to adhere to the 1979 peace treaty with Israel. The bulk of Egypt's naval inventory, moreover, is obsolete and in poor condition.

25X1 Syria-Egypt-Libya¹ 25X1 Ratio 0:3 3 0 Destroyers 8:0 8 0 Frigates 1:24 58 24 Missile Patrol/Attack 2:0 2 0 Missile Hydrofoils 59 1:1.2 50 Patrol 21 1:7 25X1 Submarines 25X1

When Egypt is removed from the calculations, the ratios change significantly, leaving Israel in a relatively comfortable position.

Frigates Missile Patrol/Attack Missile Hydrofoils Patrol Submarines	0 2 4 2 50	Syria-Libya ¹ 2 28 0 3 7	Ratio 0:2 1:1.2 2:0 16.7:1 1:2.3	25X1 25X1
				25X1

Because the size and content of Syria's weapons inventory is so heavily dependent on Soviet support levels and Libya's forces currently are at great risk, it is difficult to estimate of Arab naval force structure in the mid-1990s. We believe, however, that the Syrian or Libyan naval inventories of 1995 probably will be as large or larger than they are now, unless they destroyed in a general Arab-Israeli war.

This tabulation includes only those Libyan combatants with the range and endurance to operate in or near Israeli waters. 25X1